

CRITICAL REASONING STRATEGIES

File Session View Tools Window Help

Participants

- Participants
- Ron Purewal (Moderator)
- Abha
- adita
- Agnes
- AJ
- cheryl3007
- Darshan
- Frantz Jacques
- h
- J.Ski
- Jean
- John 1
- laylaz
- Neha Mukherjee-Nathani

27 Participants

Chat

Show All

Neha Mukherjee-Nathani: evidence

cheryl3007: circumstance

Neha Mukherjee-Nathani: conclusion

J.Ski: Evidence...Circumstance..

Virginia Griffith: cond

Priyanka: circumstance

Tej: When does conclusion re facts?

Send to This Room

Audio - Ron Purewal

Talk

Whiteboard - Man Room (Scaled 124%)

Public Screen 6

Follow Moderator

BACKUP METHOD FOR EVALUATING BOLDFACE PROBLEMS:

- * Decide whether each boldface is a **FACT** or a **CLAIM**.
 - In most cases, this will be easy
 - "The unemployment rate in January was twice the rate last May" --> **FACT**
 - "The observer's prediction will turn out to be wrong" --> **CLAIM**
 - Some statements can be either
 - "The patrons of this restaurant are extremely wealthy"
 - For statements like this one which could potentially be either facts or claims -- the presence of **QUALIFIERS** indicates a **CLAIM**
 - "clearly..." "certainly..." "must be..." "probably..."
- * Look at **INDICATOR WORDS** in the **ANSWER CHOICES** that restrict those choices to facts or claims! ... then **ELIMINATE** accordingly!

MUST BE FACTS:	MUST BE CLAIMS:	EITHER:
evidence	judgment	consideration
circumstance	conclusion *	explanation
finding(s)	position	justification
data	stance	support
observation(s)	prediction	
information	hypothesis	
fact	belief	
	objection	

- * In **THEIR** arguments, conclusions are always **CLAIMS**. However, if they ask you to "draw a conclusion", **YOUR** conclusion should be a **FACT** that you can **PROVE** from the existing facts.

1:09:55

In session for 3 hours, 47 minutes.

bold face EXCELLENT slide claims or facts

Eliminate Live! - MANHATTANGMAT STUDY HALL

File Session View Tools Window Help

Participants

- Participants
- Ron Purewal (Moderator)
- Abha
- Agnes
- AJ
- Akhlesh
- cheryl3007
- Darshan
- Frantz Jacques
- h
- J.Ski
- Jean
- John 1
- laylaz
- Neha Mukherjee-Nathani

26 Participants

Chat

Show All

second, Ron? thanks

Neha Mukherjee-Nathani: yes thanks

cheryl3007: When the boldface is just one part of a sentence, when we evaluate it, should we take into consideration the whole sentence or just the boldface. I remember encountering some tricky questions like that and they confused me. Thanks

Tammy: what is the answer? b or e?

Tammy: thanks

Audio - Ron Purewal

1:31:37

In session for 4 hours, 9 minutes.

Whiteboard - Main Room (Scaled 124%)

Public Screen 2

Follow Moderator

CR BOLDFACE PROBLEMS:

- * Longer passage
- * 1-2 statements are in boldface
- * You are asked for the **ROLE** played by those statements in the passage.

TWO-TIERED APPROACH:

(1) IDEAL APPROACH

- * Diagram the argument (either mentally or on paper)
- * **PREDICT** the answer to the question

If you don't have sufficient understanding of the passage to make this work...

(2) BACKUP: CLASSIFICATION OF THE STATEMENTS

- * Disadvantage: May not get you down to one answer choice
- * Advantage: Can employ this method even if you don't understand the argument

bold face ideal and shortcut approach

File Session View Tools Window Help

Participants

Whiteboard - Main Room (Scaled 124%)

Public Screen 3

Follow Moderator

IDEAL APPROACH:

Try to make a **FLOW DIAGRAM** of the argument:

- * Statements in boxes / bubbles
- * **ARROWS** to represent the **LOGICAL FLOW** of the passage
- * sometimes, **TRANSITION WORDS** ("but", etc.) between these boxes / bubbles
- * identify, as precisely as you can, the role played by the statements in the passage.

My friend says that Dominican food isn't any good.
However, he's wrong. I went to a Dominican restaurant last week, and the food was great.

```

graph LR
    A["Friend:  
DF no good"] -- BUT... --> B["Friend is  
wrong"]
    C["Last wk DF  
was good"] --> B
  
```

"bowling pin"
(statement that is included precisely so that we can debunk it)

USE "THEREFORE TEST" to determine the direction of the arrow

28 Participants

Chat

Show All

Tej: 2 support 1

Ugender: statement 2 supports 1

Jeremy: 2 supports 1

Agnes: S2 used to support 1

Neha Mukherjee-Nathanic: 2 is supporting

Darshan: stmt 2 is used to support 1

Send to This Room

Audio - Ron Purewal

Talk

12:33

In session for 2 hours, 50 minutes.

bold face ideal approach flow diagram

File Session View Tools Window Help

Participants

Whiteboard - Main Room (Scaled 119%)

Public Screen 9

Follow Moderator

31 Participants

Chat

Show All

heggy: prove
SR: when there is a discrepancy
Nam: when you are strengthening or weakening
Abha: discrepancy
SR: I wish we could have covered RTD as well
Ugender: Ron, can you cover few SCs in next session, please?

Send to This Room

Audio - Ron Purewal

Talk

"The conclusion above would be more reasonably drawn if which of the following were inserted into the argument as an additional premise?"

(A) FIND THE ASSUMPTION
(B) DRAW THE CONCLUSION
(C) STRENGTHEN / WEAKEN
(D) EXPLAIN THE DISCREPANCY

A		3/31 (9%)
B		
C		22/31 (70%)
D		2/31 (6%)
None		4/31 (12%)

1:37:39

In session for 3 hours, 8 minutes.

CR additional premise assumption does not have to be true

File Session View Tools Window Help

Participants

Whiteboard - Main Room (Scaled 119%)

Public Screen 4

Follow Moderator

DECODING CR PROMPTS

Some CR problems have "weird" prompts.

First, you have to understand the different question types.

FIND THE ASSUMPTION: an assumption is **NEEDED** in the passage!

* An assumption is a statement that:

- * is **NECESSARY** for the argument to work.
- * if you remove / negate the assumption, the passage **FAILS**.

DRAW THE CONCLUSION: a conclusion **MUST BE TRUE** in the passage!

* A "conclusion" is a statement that:

- * can be **PROVED** from the existing statements
- * is **NOT** part of an argument.

STRENGTHEN / WEAKEN:

* These statements

- **HELP** or **HURT** the passage
- but...
- they are **TREATED AS TRUE AHEAD OF TIME** (if they're statements)
- these are **EXTRA CONSIDERATIONS (NOT NECESSARY)**

EXPLAIN THE DISCREPANCY:

* The passage presents something that looks like a contradiction, or two things that don't appear to "work" together.

- you want an **EXTRA** statement that reconciles these two things.

31 Participants

Chat

Show All

heggy: visu
minbenz: visual
Esteban: visual
HMH: visual
Rekha: visual
greg: anything
Richard: unlimited

Send to This Room

Audio - Ron Purewal

Talk

1:38:06

In session for 3 hours, 8 minutes.

CR decoding CR prompts

File Session View Tools Window Help

Whiteboard - Main Room (Scaled 119%)

Public Screen 6

Follow Moderator

Participants

- Participants
- Ron Purewal (Moderator)
- Abha
- Adam
- Amanda Cardinale
- anisha-04
- clagan
- Curtis Brennan
- David
- Esteban
- fsayo
- greg
- heggy
- HMH

31 Participants

Chat

Show All

Nam: need actual weight

Tyler: that sounds like a statement to reconcile

Tyler: got it

Ugender: Ron ..but ultimately we are working on the assumption only right?

greg: can you approach the argument asking which statement strengthen the argument

Send to This Room

Audio - Ron Purewal

Talk

"The objection to the argument above is based on doubts about the truth of which of the following statements?"

the argument is faulty if the statement is negated / untrue

(A) FIND THE ASSUMPTION

(B) DRAW THE CONCLUSION

(C) STRENGTHEN / WEAKEN

(D) EXPLAIN THE DISCREPANCY

A	6/32 (18%)
B	1/32 (3%)
C	12/32 (37%)
D	8/32 (25%)
None	5/32 (15%)

this one is especially important:

tell whether it's good or bad a.k.a. STRONG or WEAK

"Which of the following must be studied in order to evaluate the argument presented above?"

so you want something that is EXTERNAL to the passage

(A) FIND THE ASSUMPTION

(B) DRAW THE CONCLUSION

(C) STRENGTHEN / WEAKEN

(D) EXPLAIN THE DISCREPANCY

A	8/32 (25%)
B	4/32 (12%)
C	8/32 (25%)
D	7/32 (21%)
None	5/32 (15%)

1:30:19

In session for 3 hours.

CR excellent prompts for figuring questions

File Session View Tools Window Help

Participants

Participants

Ron Purewal (Moderator)

Anna

Carlos

chamsool

Crystar

cyrus

F3H

Id

Janny 1

Mary Smith

Milan 1

mukta (Away)

Neil

Ravi Singh 1

Rusty

Whiteboard - Main Room (Scaled 124%)

Public Screen 10

Follow Moderator

Which of the following most logically completes the argument below?

Twenty percent of the stores in Morganville's downtown shopping district will fail within five years because they will be competing directly with the SaveMart discount department store newly opened in East Morganville. The downtown shopping district has lost business at this rate before and has always completely rebounded. Confidence that it will rebound again from the losses it is now about to suffer is ill founded, however, because _____.

A. the stores likely to be put out of business by direct competition from SaveMart are the downtown shopping district's anchor stores, on whose ability to draw shoppers many of the other downtown stores depend

B. the bus line that has long connected the downtown area of Morganville with East Morganville has a tradition of carrying shoppers who reside in East Morganville into downtown Morganville to shop

C. when the downtown shopping district has rebounded before, the business premises of a failed business were typically taken over by a business of the same kind as had been there before

D. SaveMart's business plan for the East Morganville store is based on earning low profits, if any, during the first five years of the store's existence

E. it is conceivable that the downtown shopping district could shrink substantially without collapsing altogether

Remember -- we need a REASON WHY this business downturn is WORSE than previous ones.

(B) No indication that the shoppers won't continue to use the bus line.

(C) just describes what happened before -- there's no discussion of the present downturn at all (and hence no rationale for why it might be more serious)

One of the MOST COMMON INCORRECT PATTERNS you'll see in CR is a description of PAST BEHAVIOR ... that is trying to trick you into assuming that the past behavior will continue! You can't just assume that past patterns will continue!

Chat

Show All

mukta: doesnt even A assume ceratin things?

Rusty: Isn't part of A represent past behavior?

sss: in A to draw shoppers many of the other downtown stores depend. -->means: other stores also need to afford the loss, and so can not rebound?

TWR: Choice A: Why cant we assume that the failed stores will be replaced by similar Anchor stores...looks like A assumes that this is not even a possibility

TWR: got it...

Audio - Ron Purewal

Talk

Public Screen 5 1:29:12

In session for 2 hours, 12 minutes.

cr past behaviour is a common wrong answer

File Session View Tools Window Help

Participants

- Ron Purewal (Moderator)
- Abha
- Adam
- Amanda Cardinale
- anisha-04
- clagan
- Curtis Brennan
- David
- Esteban
- fsayo
- greg
- heggy
- HMH

31 Participants






Whiteboard - Main Room (Scaled 119%)

Public Screen 8

EXTERNAL GUESS (NOT PROVED!!) explains

"Which of the following hypotheses best accounts for the findings of the experiment?" --> you would only have to ACCOUNT FOR findings if something were SURPRISING or UNEXPECTED about the findings.

(A) FIND THE ASSUMPTION
 (B) DRAW THE CONCLUSION
 (C) STRENGTHEN / WEAKEN
 (D) EXPLAIN THE DISCREPANCY

A		8/31 (25%)
B		8/31 (25%)
C		7/31 (22%)
D		4/31 (12%)
None		4/31 (12%)

Chat

Show All

Name: evaluate....accounts

Vikas: conclusion

heggy: prove

SR: when there is a discrepancy

Name: when you are strengthing or weakening

Abha: discrepancy

Send to This Room

Audio - Ron Purewal

Talk

1:34:39

In session for 3 hours, 5 minutes.

CR resolve the paradox prompt

File Session View Tools Window Help

Participants

Participants

Ron Purewal (Moderator)

Amir

Andrew

Aneesha

Bob

crystal

Farah

Jayc

Kurt

Mimi #2

Mohamed

Nz

PC

RobS (Away)

Samir

Chat

Show All

Siva: higher percent doesnt translate higher no..

Kurt: The crime rate could have been 10 percent and if it went up by 60 percent it would be 16. If it was 40 percent and it went up by 10 percent it would be 44.

Jayc: Ron, will solving these questions affect my gmat prep cat?

Samir: population

Siva: population

Kurt: population stays constant

Send to This Room

Audio - Ron Purewal

Talk

Whiteboard - Man Room (Scaled 124%)

Public Screen 3

Follow Moderator

The violent crime rate (number of violent crimes per 1,000 residents) in Meadowbrook is 60 percent higher now than it was four years ago. The corresponding increase for Parkdale is only 10 percent. These figures support the conclusion that residents of Meadowbrook are more likely to become victims of violent crime than are residents of Parkdale.

The argument above is flawed because it fails to take into account

- Changes in the population density of both Parkdale and Meadowbrook over the past four years.
- How the rate of population growth in Meadowbrook over the past four years compares to the corresponding rate for Parkdale.
- The ratio of violent to nonviolent crimes committed during the past four years in Meadowbrook and Parkdale.
- The violent crime rates in Meadowbrook and Parkdale four years ago.
- How Meadowbrook's expenditures for crime prevention over the past four years compare to Parkdale's expenditures.

What's meaningful:

- RELATIONSHIPS between numbers
The % increase in crime is much higher in Meadowbrook.
- EXTRA VARIABLES: What might affect these #'s that hasn't been said?
Venchei: lower growth, increased crime implies higher percentage (from a student who selected B)
Samir: crime rate 4 years ago in meadowbrook may have been much lower 4 years ago than that of parkdale
Kurt: The crime rate could have been 10 percent and if it went up by 60 percent it would be 16. If it was 40 percent and it went up by 10 percent it would be 44.

This is a per-capita rate. The point of per-capita rates is to get rid of the effect of population size.
(In fact, the point of units of the form "unit1 PER unit2" is generally to take out the confounding effect of unit2.)
e.g. $\frac{\text{miles}}{\text{gallon}}$
--> If you have these units, then

--> This person is saying that the population itself is an extra variable that matters.

--> These students have identified the INITIAL / STARTING values of the quantities as significant.

In session for 1 hour, 51 minutes.

cr statistics good question per unit capita is unit INDEPENDENT

File Session View Tools Window Help

Participants

Participants			
Ron Purewal (Moderator)			
ABauer 1			
Amir #2			
Anuradha			
Anul Murugan			
ASB			
chris			
crystal			
Daphne			
Hema			
hemant			
ishh59			
Jas			
kathleen b			
Kurt			

Whiteboard - Main Room (Scaled 124%)

Public Screen 8

Follow Moderator

QUICK SUMMARY of today's most important concepts:

1/ Watch out for STATISTICS THAT DON'T COMPORT WITH EACH OTHER

e.g.

- * Percentages / proportions / ratios VS absolute numbers
- * Per-unit rates VS aggregate totals
(e.g. pounds per production worker) (e.g. total pounds)

2/ Make sure that you BOIL ARGUMENTS DOWN TO THEIR ESSENTIALS

- > Figure out WHAT AFFECTS THE CONCLUSION or LINE OF REASONING in the argument
- > STAY FOCUSED

Chat

Show All

ss #2: make abstract to be more concrete, yes, thanks ron

Anul Murugan: Thanks Ron

chris: thank you Ron

PJsom: Thank you so much

ASB: Thanks!

Vasant Chandra: Thanks Ron, great as always!

Mee Mee 1: Thank you 😊

Send to This Room

Audio - Ron Purewal

Talk

Public Screen 8 1:30:48

In session for 3 hours, 36 minutes.

cr statistics watch out for percentile per unit rates

The screenshot shows a Zoom meeting window with a whiteboard titled "Whiteboard - Main Room (Scaled 124%)". The whiteboard content is as follows:

SUMMARY: CONCLUSION / INFERENCE C.R. PROBLEMS

- * You need to pick the answer that is **PROVED BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT**
- * You need to **STAY IN SCOPE**

Upside: You can automatically eliminate certain answers (i.e., things that are out of scope)

Downside: You have to read the passage **VERY, VERY CAREFULLY**

KNOW:

"Draw conclusion" / "Inference" CR problems are VERY different from ALL other CR problem types.

The interface also shows a list of participants on the left, a chat window with messages, and an audio control bar at the bottom.

cr stay **WITHIN** the scope for conclusion and inference

File Session View Tools Window Help

Participants

- Participants
- Ron Purewal (Away, Moderator)
- Alex (Away)
- alina ospava
- Andy
- c cheng
- Ceda
- chris
- cindy
- dave
- gmatinaweeek
- Jorge
- margaret
- Nidhi
- parag

20 Participants

Chat

Show All

C cheng: adv. costs will rise

Ceda: industry will not use famous songs

c cheng: industry will not use famous songs

Rikin: will not use

chris: The adv industry will no longer use famous songs

c cheng: but can't famous singers sing non-famous songs?

alina ospava: c?

Send to This Room

Audio - Ron Purewal

Talk

Whiteboard - Man Room (Scaled 124%)

Public Screen 2

Follow Moderator

Excavation of the ancient city of Kourion on the island of Cyprus revealed a pattern of debris and collapsed buildings typical of towns devastated by earthquakes. Archaeologists have hypothesized that the destruction was due to a major earthquake known to have occurred near the island in A.D. 365. Which of the following, if true, most strongly supports the archaeologists' hypothesis?

(A) Bronze ceremonial drinking vessels that are often found in graves dating from years preceding and following A.D. 365 were also found in several graves near Kourion.

(B) No coins minted after A.D. 365 were found in Kourion, but coins minted before that year were found in abundance.

(C) Most modern histories of Cyprus mention that an earthquake occurred near the island in A.D. 365.

(D) Several small statues carved in styles current in Cyprus in the century between A.D. 300 and 400 were found in Kourion.

(E) Stone inscriptions in a form of the Greek alphabet that was definitely used in Cyprus after A.D. 365 were found in Kourion.

REMEMBER!
unlike "find the assumption" -- you are NOT trying to pick something that MUST be true.
instead:
whatever they say, you just assume it's the case -- and see what sort of EFFECT it has on the argument.

the best thing you can do on STRENGTHEN / WEAKEN:
SIMPLIFY THE ARGUMENT!
try your best to boil the argument down to ONE OR TWO STATEMENTS.

simplified argument:
* PREMISE: kourion was destroyed by an earthquake.
THEREFORE
* CONCLUSION: it must have been THE earthquake THAT HAPPENED IN YEAR 365.

let's investigate (b) and (c):
(b) PINPOINTS THE DATE at year 365 (the coins suddenly stopped at year 365 --> this is strong evidence that something cataclysmic happened in exactly year 365)
STRENGTHENER!

(c) says that "there was an earthquake in 365."
...but this is ALREADY "known to have occurred"
so this is no help.
DOESN'T STRENGTHEN
if you re-iterate something that is already known, this is NOT a strengthener!

1:06:09

In session for 1 hour, 41 minutes.

cr strengthen weaken simplify the argument

File Session View Tools Window Help

Participants

Whiteboard - Main Room (Scaled 124%)

Public Screen 10

Follow Moderator

Participants

Ron Purewal (Moderator)

Amir

Ammar

Andrew

Aneesha

Bob

crystal

Kurt

Mimi #3

Mohamed (Away)

Nz

PC

SANDHYA

satish

Selin

Chat

Show All

Siva: what is the conclusion of this arg?

Selin: so would you suggest reading the question before reading the

Siva: ok...paradox?

Kurt: If you don't understand the structure/meaning of the passage, you guess and move on or could the answer choices offer clues?

Selin: well if it's just one question though, point being, should you jus and move on?

Audio - Ron Purewal

Talk

Twenty years ago, Balzania put in place regulations requiring operators of surface mines to pay for the reclamation of mined-out land. Since then, reclamation technology has not improved. Yet, the average reclamation cost for a surface coal mine being reclaimed today is only four dollars per ton of coal that the mine produced, less than half what it cost to reclaim surface mines in the years immediately after the regulations took effect.

Which of the following, if true, most helps to account for the drop in reclamation costs described?

A. Even after Balzania began requiring surface mine operators to pay reclamation costs, coal mines in Balzania continued to be less expensive to operate than coal mines in almost any other country.

B. In the twenty years since the regulations took effect, the use of coal as a fuel has declined from the level it was at in the previous twenty years.

C. Mine operators have generally ceased surface mining in the mountainous areas of Balzania because reclamation costs per ton of coal produced are particularly high for mines in such areas.

D. Even after Balzania began requiring surface mine operators to pay reclamation costs, surface mines continued to produce coal at a lower total cost than underground mines.

E. As compared to twenty years ago, a greater percentage of the coal mined in Balzania today comes from surface mines.

WHAT DO WE WANT? Some other reason why reclaiming/repairing the land has gotten cheaper!

This takes away the effect of the total volume of the mine. (Without this, smaller mines would lower the number.)

The average cost of repairing the mined land has gone way down. This decrease is NOT because the technology has become more efficient.

The argument is only concerned with costs within Balzania.

This may affect coal prices, but can't affect the price of the mountainous areas.

Now, they don't have to reclaim the mines that are most expensive to reclaim!

The cost of coal *production* doesn't matter.

This doesn't affect reclamation costs.

One of the biggest issues in CR -- DON'T start examining answer choices UNTIL YOU KNOW WHAT YOU ARE LOOKING FOR.

A 2/21 (9%)

B 3/21 (14%)

C 7/21 (33%)

D 4/21 (19%)

E 3/21 (14%)

Public Screen 6 1:20:51

In session for 2 hours, 21 minutes.

don't start examining answer choices until we are sure what we are looking for

File Session View Tools Window Help

Participants

Whiteboard - Main Room (Scaled 119%)

Public Screen 3

Follow Moderator

OVERALL REVIEW OF "EXPLAIN THE SITUATION" CR PROBLEMS

1 * The PRIMARY CHALLENGE of these problems is to UNDERSTAND WHAT THE QUESTION ACTUALLY IS!

The following TEMPLATE helps in understanding the question:

_____ has happened / is true / is happening.
 Normally, this would mean _____.
 THIS TIME, _____ is happening instead. — EXPLAIN THIS

2 * The correct answer will ALWAYS be OUTSIDE THE SCOPE of the passage (in at least some way).
 -- If you see a choice that *does* stay INSIDE the scope of the passage, then it's incorrect. 🖱️

3 * you will have to make REASONABLE ASSUMPTIONS to make the connection(s) required.

DO NOT USE FORMAL LOGIC -- NO "MUST"s!!
 Think like a "real world person" -- including the assumptions that such people would make

Chat

Show All

andres: you need to explain why not

Nishant Kumar: i tink "feed exclusvley in the wild" is trigger since they have to be taught to hunt by dults

Pete K 1: wait adult dolphins vs child dolphins or exclusive wild offspring vs feed offspring

Jasmine: there's no info in the passage that says the offspring MUST feed in the wild?

Send to This Room

Audio - Ron Purewal

Talk

Public Screen 2 1:08:55

In session for 6 hours, 41 minutes.

explain the sitation can make assumptions not MUST

File Session View Tools Window Help

Participants

- Ron Purewal (Moderator)
- alejandra
- alice21
- Chandra
- Crystar
- Cyrus Chan
- Eddie
- Gaurav 2
- Gaurav 3 (Away)
- Gopal Koli
- mike
- Nisha Wadhvani
- Pratik Mehta
- Purnendu
- Ravi 2

Whiteboard - Main Room (Scaled 124%)

Public Screen 3

DO NOT QUESTION STATED FACTS

NOTICE -- when you think LESS FORMALLY about critical reasoning, IT'S EASIER!!

what is this relationship?

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX xxx xxxxp
 XXXXXXXX.

RESPONSE:

However,
 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX
 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXX XXXXXXXXXXXX,
 because XXXXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX.

The economist says that the economy of Burdistan is strong, because unemployment numbers are low and the government has been creating new jobs at record rates.

HOWEVER,
 these statistics do not actually support the economist's claim,
 We want to weaken this claim.

BECAUSE
 the government jobs are temporary and funded from money that will soon be exhausted.

This means that we have to "poke a hole" in the argument WHILE STILL ACCEPTING THE FACTS HERE AS TRUE!!

THIS IS A WEAKEN QUESTION --
 You bring in something *from outside the scope* to make the argument weaker.

Chat

Show All

Sid: however trade deficits are high because of various govt spending

Sunil Varun: ...this is only true because it is recovering from a period of high unemployment

Ravi 2: std of living will be low because of less jobs

Gaurav 2: do you want to say that the part after however contradicts the conclusion and part after because gives the reason for the contradiction

alice21: we should not question the fact before "however", right?

Send to This Room

Audio - Ron Purewal

Talk

Public Screen 2 30:17

In session for 1 hour, 12 minutes.

however because blanks weaken example

The screenshot shows a Zoom meeting window with a whiteboard. The whiteboard content is as follows:

A good way to think about paraphrasing:
"How would I explain this OUT LOUD?"
... i.e., without sounding as though you're reading a book

If you absolutely CAN'T do this (i.e., you're stuck with literal reading of the exact words that are present),
then ... this means that you don't really understand (or don't understand at all) what the passage is saying.

IF that happens,
move on to the back-up method ("fact vs. claim"), which is something that you can still use even if you don't understand the logical flow!

The interface also shows a list of 26 participants, a chat window with several messages, and audio controls for Ron Purewal. The meeting duration is 1:28:14.

if paraphrasing does not work move to other approach

File Session View Tools Window Help

Participants

Participants									
Ron Purewal (Moderator)									
Amir									
Andrew									
Aneesha									
Bob									
crystal									
Farah									
Kurt									
Mimi #2									
Mohamed									
Nz									
PC									
Pradeep									
RobS									
SANDHYA									

Whiteboard - Main Room (Scaled 124%)

Public Screen 9

PERCENTAGES ARE NOT NUMBERS!!!

- * If a percentage of something goes up, then that result doesn't necessarily signify an absolute increase in the quantity itself.
- * Same goes for decreases.

If they ask you a question about "component percentages", this is very often the point!

Here is an illustration that is closer to home:

A family makes \$100,000 per year, and spends \$1000 per month on food (including groceries and restaurant food). = 12,000 in the year

--> In this case, food is 12% of the family's budget.

In the following year, the family's primary breadwinner is laid off, and so the family only makes \$25,000 that year.

They stop eating out at restaurants, and so they only spend \$500 per month on food. = 6000 for the year

--> In this case, food is now 24% of the family budget.

TRY TO MAKE YOUR OWN ANALOGIES!

For *all* CR problems

--> In other words, try to think of analogous situations in which the same sort of phenomenon occurs, but in which the objective subject matter is different.

Audio - Ron Purewal

Public Screen 10 55:40

In session for 1 hour, 56 minutes.

percentages are not numbers

File Session View Tools Window Help

Participants

Participants

- Ron Purewal (Moderator)
- Abhay Jain
- abhishek
- ADITYA SINGH
- Alfe
- Amer
- andres
- Charmian
- Chris
- Cliff
- Dinesh
- Dip
- Gaurav
- Grish

Chat

Show All

Abhay Jain: occupation....mine workers?

Igor: a chem factory in town A

andres: something else in town A is going on?

Grish: town A people chew tobacco

Neeraj Nair: nuclear radiation

ADITYA SINGH: pollution

Swanna: thav. smoke smethinn different?

Send to This Room

Audio - Ron Purewal

Talk

Whiteboard - Main Room (Scaled 119%)

Public Screen 5

Follow Moderator

Denoma, a major consumer-electronics maker, had a sizeable decline in sales revenue for its most recent fiscal year. This result appears surprising, because electronics retailers report that although their overall sales were considerably lower than in the previous year, their sales revenue from Denoma models actually grew, largely thanks to some innovative and popular models that Denoma introduced. something that LEADS to results

Which of the following, if true, does most to explain the apparently surprising result?

For this to work, Denoma needs to sell *something else* besides its own models -- and that's what decreased.

- Because of the need to educate the public about its new models' capabilities, Denoma's advertising spending was higher than normal over the period. Irrelevant to revenue.
- For the period at issue, Denoma's major competitors reported declines in revenue that were, in percentage terms, greater than Denoma's. We don't care about Denoma's competitors.
- A significant proportion of Denoma's revenue comes from making components for other consumer-electronics manufacturers.
- Unlike some of its major competitors, Denoma has no lines of business outside consumer electronics to provide revenue when retail sales of consumer electronics are weak.
- During the period, consumer-electronics retailers sold remaining units of Denoma's superseded models at prices that were deeply discounted from those models' original prices. ... we know that, despite this statement, sales OF DENOMA MODELS are not the issue.

Revenue from Denoma MODELS went up has happened / is true / is happening. The whole Denoma company's sales would also increase!

Normally, this would mean sales DECREASED has happened / is true / is happening instead. EXPLAIN THIS

We need something that would make the overall company sales go down -- besides the co's models.

A	<input type="checkbox"/>	3/34 (8%)
B	<input type="checkbox"/>	5/34 (14%)
C	<input type="checkbox"/>	9/34 (26%)
D	<input type="checkbox"/>	
E	<input type="checkbox"/>	13/34 (38%)

Public Screen 5 59:42 In session for 6 hours, 31 minutes.

resolve the paradox normally this happens this time something else happens reason explains both

File Session View Tools Window Help

Participants

- Ron Purewal (Moderator)
- alejandra
- alice21
- Chandra
- Crystar
- Cyrus Chan
- Derek BOOlander
- Eddie
- Gaurav 2
- Gaurav 3 (Away)
- Gopal Koll
- Michael Liu
- Milan 1
- Pratik Mehta
- Purnendu

Whiteboard - Main Room (Scaled 124%)

Public Screen 6

Follow Moderator

What are we weakening?
 The argument claims that volunteering (via its attendant endorphins) actually LENGTHENS people's lives (i.e., CAUSES people to live longer).
 We want to weaken this argument.

Argument says VOLUNTEER ----> LONG LIFE

One way to weaken "X causes Y" is to give evidence suggesting that it's BACKWARD -- in other words, that Y actually causes X.

Another way is to show that SOMETHING ELSE causes BOTH "x" and "y".

If some quality contributes to both volunteerism AND long life, then the argument is weakened.

female → volunteerism
 female → long life

One type of weakener: ~~something that shows that living longer causes volunteerism~~

Audio - Ron Purewal

Public Screen 2 53:44 In session for 1 hour, 36 minutes.

weaken questions good wording causal effect solution

File Session View Tools Window Help

Participants

Participants

- Ron Purewal (Moderator)
- alejandra
- alice21
- Chandra
- Crystar
- Cyrus Chan
- Derek BOOlander
- Eddie
- Gaurav 2
- Gaurav 3 (Away)
- Gopal Koll
- Michael Liu
- Milan 1
- Pratik Mehta
- Purnendu

Whiteboard - Main Room (Scaled 124%)

Public Screen 2

When people engage in activities that help others, their brain releases endorphins, the brain's natural opiates, which induce in people a feeling of well-being. It has been suggested that regular release of endorphins increases people's longevity. And a statistic on adults who regularly engage in volunteer work helping others shows that they live longer, on average, than adults who do not volunteer. However, that statistic would be what we would expect even if volunteering does not ~~increase~~ lengthens longevity, because _____

FACTS!!!
claim

When you see a blank, you have to FIGURE OUT how the blank fits into the argument.
USUALLY the "blank" questions are of the same types to which you've already become accustomed.

Which of the following most logically completes the argument?

- In the communities studied, women were much more likely to do regular volunteer work than men were, and women tend to live longer than men do.
- The number of young adults who do regular volunteer work is on the increase
- The feelings of well-being induced by endorphins can, at least for a time, mask the symptoms of various conditions and diseases, provided the symptoms are mild.
- It is rare for a person to keep up a regular schedule of volunteer work throughout his or her life.
- Some people find that keeping a commitment to do regular volunteer work becomes a source of stress in their lives.

What are we weakening?
The argument claims that volunteering (via its attendant endorphins) actually LENGTHENS people's lives (i.e., CAUSES people to live longer).
We want to weaken this argument.

Sid: well I thought if symptoms were masked then it will go undiagnosed..

Chat

Show All

vtсандers: draw a conclusion
Chandra: cause and effect
Gaurav 2: cause and effect
Sunil Varun: conclusion
Gopal Koll: Strengthen?
Sudhanshu 1: explain the paradox

Audio - Ron Purewal

59:09

In session for 1 hour, 41 minutes.

weaken questions good wording causal effect